

**Appl. No.** : **10/660,460**  
**Filed** : **September 11, 2003**

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed December 6, 2005, the Examiner objected to the preamble of Claim 26. The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 2, 16, 17, 26-28, 42, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Olszak et al. (Published Application US 2004/0113050 A1, "Olszak"). The Examiner also rejected Claims 3-10, 18-20, 29-36, 43-46, 48, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olszak. The Examiner stated that Claims 11-15, 21-25, and 37-41 would be allowable if their corresponding base and intervening claims are allowable. Applicant addresses the foregoing issues raised by the Examiner.

### **Objection to Claim 26**

Applicant has amended the preamble of Claim 26 to state a possible use of the system, for the sake of expediency, and not to limit the scope of the claim. Applicant notes that there may be other uses of the system having the limitations recited in Claim 26, and reserves the right to pursue claims directed to such uses in a continuation and/or other related applications.

### **Rejections Based on Olszak**

With respect to independent Claim 1, Applicant notes that Olszak does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a limitation where relative movement between a platform and a segmented detector can be in sub-pixel sized steps. Olszak appears to teach a concept of pre-imaging a sample to determine an area of interest for a subsequent high-resolution imaging of that area of interest. Olszak teaches various methods for achieving such pre-imaging. However, Olszak does not teach a concept where the sample platform and/or the detector moves in sub-pixel sized steps. Moreover, Olszak provides no indication as to why step movements, no less sub-pixel sized step movements, might be desirable. Thus, Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Olszak, and Applicant respectfully requests that rejection of Claim be reconsidered.

With respect to independent Claim 16, Applicant notes that Olszak does not disclose nor suggest, *inter alia*, a limitation of combining captured signals from plurality of relative positions between an array image and a segmented detector. As stated above, Olszak teaches pre-imaging, but does not make any suggestion as to combining of signals from different relative positions.

**Appl. No.** : **10/660,460**  
**Filed** : **September 11, 2003**

Thus, Claim 16 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Olszak, and Applicant respectfully requests that rejection of Claim be reconsidered.

With respect to independent Claim 26, Applicant notes that Olszak does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a limitation where relative movement between a platform and a segmented detector can be in an amount having sub-pixel sized values. As stated above, Olszak teaches pre-imaging, but does not make any suggestion on providing movements by an amount having sub-pixel sized values. Thus, Claim 26 is neither anticipated nor made obvious by Olszak, and Applicant respectfully requests that rejection of Claim be reconsidered.

Applicant notes that rejected dependent claims that depend from Claim 1, 16, or 26 include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims that stand rejected based on Olszak, are patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

**Allowable Subject Matter of Claims 11-15, 21-25, and 37-41**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful consideration of Claims 11-15, 21-25, and 37-41.

**Summary**

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to initiate the same with the undersigned.


Appl. No. : 10/660,460  
Filed : September 11, 2003

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2-16-06

By:   
James W. Chang  
Registration No. 52,718  
Agent of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

2339543 / kmb  
013106